

REMARKS

The applicant thanks the examiner for allowing claims 48-50 and 60-65, and for indicating that claim 41 would be in condition for allowance if rewritten in independent form to include all the limitations of its base claims. Accordingly, we have amended dependent claim 41 to be in independent form and to include all of the limitations of claims 39 and 32.

For clarity, the applicant has amended claim 32 to recite "an output for transmitting light" instead of "an output for receiving light." We submit that this should not raise new issues that would require the examiner to conduct a further search. The applicant has amended claims 40 and 41 to recite "the phosphor layer" instead of "a phosphor layer." We submit that these claim amendments simply provide proper antecedent basis.

Prior Art Rejections

Independent claim 32

The examiner has rejected claims 32-37, 39-40, 42, 46-47, and 51-58 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Haeefe (U.S. 6,331,156). We submit, however, that Haeefe neither discloses nor suggests "a semiconductor light source having an encasement that includes an aperture ... wherein each aperture receives an associated portion of the proximal end of the optical element ..," as recited in claim 32.

FIG. 7A and the accompanying text on pages 19 and 20 in the applicant's specification describes an exemplary LED configuration in which an aperture of the plastic encasement 412 receives a portion of the proximal end of the fiber optic bundle 406.

Although Haeefe describes coupling an LED 20, having a "standard housing," to an optical element, namely fiber-optic 16, in FIG. 3a-3d, FIG. 4a-4b, and in accompanying text on col. 5, line 40 to col. 6, line 25, Haeefe is silent as to whether the encasement of LED 20 includes an aperture that receives an associated portion of the proximal end of the fiber-optic 16. For example, FIG.s 3a and 3c show a configuration in which fiber-optic 16 is mounted on circuit

board 19 adjacent to LED 20 “in a manner such that there results an optimal position between the entry surface of the fiber-optic 16 and of the LED 20” (col. 5, lines 40-44). The configuration, however, does not provide any hint that LED 20 includes an aperture that receives a portion of the proximal end of fiber-optic 16. Other embodiments of Heafele clearly show that the encasement of the LED does not include an aperture that receives a portion of a proximal end of an optical element. For example, FIG.s 3b and 3d show an optical system 24 located between LED 20 and the proximal end of fiber-optic 16. In further examples, FIG.s 4a and 4b show a reflector 26 located between LED 25 and the proximal fiber-optic 16.

Dependent claims 38, 43-45, and 59

The examiner rejected claims 38, 43-45, and 59 under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Haefele in view of Mueller-Mach (U.S. 6,696,703), Begemann (U.S. 6,793,703), or Haar (U.S. 6,584,335), respectively. Neither Mueller-Mach, Begemann, nor Haar disclose or suggest “a semiconductor light source having an encasement that includes an aperture ... wherein each aperture receives an associated portion of the proximal end of the optical element ...,” or anything that would remedy the foregoing deficiencies of Haefele with respect to claim 32.

Each of the claims depending on independent claim 32, are patentable for at least the same reason as the claim on which they depend is patentable. It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue, or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Applicant : Yuri Kazakevich
Serial No. : 09/944,495
Filed : August 31, 2001
Page : 16 of 16

Attorney's Docket No.: 00167-376001 / 02-31-0382

Please apply charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050, referencing Attorney Docket Number 00167-376001.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 1, 2005



Frank R. Occhiuti
Reg. No. 35,306

Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110-2804
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906

20994901.doc